

1 PAUL V. LANKFORD, CA BAR NO. 181506
plankford@thelenreid.com
2 LYNN R. FIORENTINO, CA BAR NO. 226691
lfiorentino@thelenreid.com
3 THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP
101 Second Street, Suite 1800
4 San Francisco, California 94105
Telephone: (415) 371-1200
5 Facsimile: (415) 371-1211
6 Attorneys for Defendant
DORMAN LONG TECHNOLOGY, LIMITED
7

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 ROBERT CLICK and MARIE CLICK,
12 Plaintiffs,
13 vs.
14 DORMAN LONG TECHNOLOGY,
15 LIMITED et al.,
16 Defendants.

USDC Case No: C 06 1936 PJH

STIPULATION AND **PROPOSED**
ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO
RESPOND TO UNVERIFIED
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

17
18 This stipulation is made by and between plaintiffs Robert Click and Marie Click
19 (“plaintiffs”) and defendant Dorman Long Technology Limited (“DLT”), by and through their
20 respective attorneys of record, The Arns Law Firm and Thelen Reid & Priest, LLP.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
RECITALS

The stipulation is based on the following facts:

1. DLT was served with plaintiffs’ Unverified Complaint for Damages and Demand for Jury Trial (“the Complaint”) on or about April 27, 2006.
2. At the time DLT was served with the Complaint, DLT was already a party defendant to plaintiffs’ first complaint, Case No. 05-03037 PJH.
3. The Court granted DLT’s motion to dismiss on September 6, 2006, finding that the first complaint, Case No. 05-03037 PJH, was duplicative of the Complaint in the subject action.

3. The parties agree that DLT is granted an extension up to and including October 18, 2006 to answer the Complaint in the subject action.

Dated: September 30, 2006

THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP

By Syna R. Fiorentino
Paul V. Lankford
Lynn R. Fiorentino
Attorneys for Defendant
DORMAN LONG TECHNOLOGY LIMITED

Dated: September 22, 2006

THE ARNS LAW FIRM

By 
Morgan C. Smith
Attorneys for Plaintiffs
ROBERT CLICK and MARIE CLICK

[PROPOSED] ORDER

PURSUANT TO THE ABOVE STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

10/4/06

